# NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

#### **SEPTEMBER 10, 2015**

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Building, 201 West Gray Street, on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2015. Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <a href="http://www.normanok.gov/content/boards-commissions">http://www.normanok.gov/content/boards-commissions</a> at least twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Sandy Bahan called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andy Sherrer Roberta Pailes Erin Williford Tom Knotts Sandy Bahan Jim Gasaway Dave Boeck Cindy Gordon

MEMBERS ABSENT

Chris Lewis

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Susan Connors, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Jane Hudson, Principal Planner
Janay Greenlee, Planner II
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst II
Kathryn Walker, Asst. City Attorney
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer

NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION MINUTES September 10, 2015, Page 2

Item No. 2, being:

CONSENT DOCKET

Chair Bahan announced that the Consent Docket consisted of the following items:

Item No. 3, being:

APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 13, 2015 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

Item No. 4, being:

PP-1516-5 — CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY HUETTNERS, INC. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR LOT 2, BLOCK 1, VALUE PLACE ADDITION FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 5451 HUETTNER DRIVE, ONE-HALF MILE SOUTH OF INDIAN HILLS ROAD AND EAST OF YORK DRIVE.

\* \* :

Chair Bahan asked if any member of the Commission wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, she asked whether any member of the audience wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, she asked for discussion by the Planning Commission.

# DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Dave Boeck moved to approve the Consent Docket as presented. Andy Sherrer seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailes, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts,

Sandy Bahan, Jim Gasaway, Dave Boeck, Cindy Gordon

NAYES None

MEMBERS ABSENT Chris Lewis

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to approve the Consent Docket as presented, passed by a vote of 8-0.

Item No. 3, being:

APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 13, 2015 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

The minutes were approved on the Consent Docket by a vote of 8-0.

Item No. 4, being:

PP-1516-5 - CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY HUETTNERS, INC. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR LOT 2, BLOCK 1, VALUE PLACE ADDITION FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 5451 HUETTNER DRIVE, ONE-HALF MILE SOUTH OF INDIAN HILLS ROAD AND EAST OF YORK DRIVE.

## ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

- 1. Location Map
- 2. Preliminary Plat
- 3. Staff Report
- 4. Transportation Impacts
- 5. Preliminary Site Development Plan
- 6. Request for Alley Waiver
- 7. Pre-Development Summary
- 8. Greenbelt Commission Comments

The Preliminary Plat for <u>Lot 2</u>, <u>Block 1</u>, <u>VALUE PLACE ADDITION</u> was recommended for approval by the City Council on the Consent Docket by a vote of 8-0.

Item No. 5a, being:

R-1415-84 – SHAZ INVESTMENT GROUP, L.L.C. AND RIEGER, L.L.C. REQUEST AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION TO MIXED USE DESIGNATION FOR APPROXIMATELY 760 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH OF POST OAK ROAD ON BOTH THE EAST AND WEST SIDES OF  $36^{1H}$  Avenue S.E. (SE  $\frac{1}{4}$  of Section 10, Township 8 North, Range 2 West; E  $\frac{1}{2}$  of Section 15; and W  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the S  $\frac{1}{2}$  of Section 14).

and

Item No. 5b, being:

O-1415-33 — SHAZ INVESTMENT GROUP, L.L.C. AND RIEGER, L.L.C. REQUEST REZONING FROM A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR APPROXIMATELY 760 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH OF POST OAK ROAD ON BOTH THE EAST AND WEST SIDES OF 36TH AVENUE S.E. (SE  $\frac{1}{4}$  OF SECTION 10, TOWNSHIP 8 NORTH, RANGE 2 WEST; E  $\frac{1}{2}$  OF SECTION 15; AND W  $\frac{3}{4}$  OF THE S  $\frac{1}{2}$  OF SECTION 14).

#### ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

- 1. Location Map
- 2. Postponement Memo
- 3. Request for Postponement
- 4. Excerpt of Minutes of July 9, 2015 Planning Commission

## DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Jim Gasaway moved to postpone Resolution No. R-1415-84 and Ordinance No. O-1415-33 to the October 8, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailes, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts,

Sandy Bahan, Jim Gasaway, Dave Boeck, Cindy Gordon

NAYES None

MEMBERS ABSENT Chris Lewis

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to postpone Resolution No. R-1415-84 and Ordinance No. O-1415-33 to the October 8, 2015 Planning Commission meeting, passed by a vote of 8-0.

Item No. 6, being:

O-1415-43 - MICHAEL MILLER REQUESTS SPECIAL USE FOR A TYPE I BED AND BREAKFAST ESTABLISHMENT FOR PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 2107 WESTWOOD DRIVE.

#### ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

- 1. Location Map
- 2. Postponement Memo
- 3. Request for Postponement
- 4. Excerpt of August 13, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes

# DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Jim Gasaway moved to postpone Ordinance No. O-1415-43 to the October 8, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailes, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts,

Sandy Bahan, Jim Gasaway, Dave Boeck, Cindy Gordon

NAYES None

MEMBERS ABSENT Chris Lewis

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to postpone Ordinance No. O-1415-43 to the October 8, 2015 Planning Commission meeting, passed by a vote of 8-0.

### Item No. 7, being:

O-1516-11 – NORMAN COMMUNITY CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE REQUESTS SPECIAL USE FOR A CHURCH, TEMPLE OR OTHER PLACE OF WORSHIP FOR PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT AND LOCATED AT 1801 NORTH PORTER AVENUE.

#### ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

- 1. Location Map
- 2. Staff Report
- 3. Site Plan
- 4. Pre-Development Summary
- 5. Staff Report Addendum (distributed at meeting)
- 6. Exterior Appearance Variance Site Plan (distributed at meeting)

#### PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Janay Greenlee – The Norman Community Church of the Nazarene is requesting a special use for a church, temple, or other place of worship at 1801 North Porter. This is the existing zoning; it is R-1. This is the subject tract. This is the existing land use, currently the church and the parking lot are there. And this is the church itself.

I'm going to go back through just a little bit of background with this proposal. There's two lots on this. The front lot is 15.2 acres and is platted. They own a rear lot, which is 15 acres as well, approximately, that is not platted. The special use is requested for the front lot only with the existing church on it currently.

In August of 1961, this portion of land was annexed by the City of Norman. At that time there was no zoning classification given to it, so under right it just went straight to R-1. In November of 1977, there was an adoption of Ordinance O-7778-22 which removed the church by right from R-1. Then in February of 1996, a plat was submitted to Norman for the church. The location map provided by staff at that time actually showed the property zoned as A-2. It went forward. They had the final plat. The plat was approved and filed of record September 16, 1997. They went ahead and came through for a building permit, received that building permit under the A-2 zoning. It was a mistake at that time. It should have had the special use for the church under A-2 because of what had previously taken place. So they built the church. Now they're coming forward. They want to expand. So we're bringing them into conformance. It is zoned R-1, so a church can be allowed with that special use. So that's just a little bit of background history for this application.

So this is the site itself. This is looking to the south from the north parking lot. This is looking to the north at the monument business with the cemetery directly behind it. The cemetery. This is to the west with the R-2, two-family zoning to the west. This is to the southeast. This is directly east. So the 15 acres includes the site itself where the church is, and then they own an additional 15 acres behind that that abuts up to Sutton Wilderness. This is looking south on Porter. And north on Porter.

You received tonight a supplement in your package because with the special use they are requesting a variance to the masonry requirement. I'll go through the additional buildings. The first building is a youth center that they're going to build on the north of the lot with a basketball court and volleyball courts. There is an existing cell tower here. This is a bus barn. So, as you can see on your site development map, the red is where they're going to provide 80% masonry and the yellow is where they're going to provide 48" of masonry façade at the base of each building. This is an addition to the existing church, which will have the masonry on the north façade, as well as the addition for offices on the south. In the future, they plan to build a new sanctuary that will front Porter and they will have masonry on the west, north, and south sides. That is an addendum to the special use that will be attached as a special condition with the special use.

Staff does support Ordinance No. O-1516-11 and I would be happy to answer any questions.

2. Mr. Boeck - Do they currently have a variance on the masonry requirement on the existing building?

Ms. Greenlee – This is the front of the building, which is the masonry and then this is the rear building that's attached to it. But that's the sanctuary. They want to match what is the existing masonry right now.

Mr. Boeck – So when they're only going up 48 inches, where is that line?

Ms. Greenlee -You have the site map and an addendum to this for the variance.

Mr. Boeck – Well, that's why I was wondering what they had, 'cause those classroom wings that they've got now, the masonry goes all the way up to the soffit.

Ms. Greenlee - Yes, on the sides.

3. Mr. Boeck – Now, refresh my memory, or our memory, on what the current code says in terms of masonry coverage. Is it on all sides?

Ms. Greenlee – Yes. 80% of all sides, exclusive of windows, glass, doors, and roofs. So it will be 80% here, here, here. Anything facing Porter that can be seen is going to be 80% masonry. But here will be the 48" from the base up and here. And this building isn't going anywhere. Obviously, they're keeping this and adding here.

Mr. Boeck – Well, from the aesthetic point of view, I really don't have a problem with the center building – the current building that's existing there when they add those two wings. It's that youth center there. They have full masonry on the west wall and then turn the corner and only have 48 inches of masonry and the rest metal building. I have a problem with that.

- 4. Ms. Pailes Is that correct, that the part that is not masonry will be ribbed metal building? Ms. Greenlee Yes.
- 5. Mr. Sherrer I would second that. I agree with Commissioner Boeck. I think that would be worth consideration as it moves forward if it does, in fact, based on whatever the applicant chooses to do. I think that would be a wonderful consideration to have that be considered as a part of the package as it relates to the youth building. Originally, I thought about the other areas, too, but I think that those with the metal building they are, I don't see an issue there. But I do think that having that one building be also considered for a little higher than 48 inches would make some sense.
- 6. Ms. Connors If I just might comment. We did hand out some suggested conditions of approval with the map. On item (b), if you wanted to amend the 80% -- and we haven't heard from the applicant yet, but you could add Building 2 also required on the west and south sides would also have the 80% masonry. We could incorporate that into the item (b) of the conditions.
- 7. Ms. Gordon Wouldn't that be item (c)?
- 8. Ms. Bahan Just change the 48 to 80.
- 9. Ms. Connors Yes. We would just say the west and south facades.
- 10. Mr. Knotts -- Is there a fence around this?
  - Ms. Greenlee No.
  - Mr. Knotts I see the property line delineated.

Ms. Greenlee – No, there's not a fence currently. There's not any fencing proposed. If they did decide to do that when they submitted for application for a building permit, that would be something that would be looked at. But there's nothing submitted.

Ms. Connors – They can build a fence. We don't issue permits for fences, so they could build a 6' fence – I think they can build up to an 8' fence without a permit on the side and rear yards.

Ms. Greenlee – Yeah. Not in the front.

#### PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

The applicant's representative was available to answer questions but did not make a presentation.

#### **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

None

# DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1516-11 to the City Council, amended to include the conditions recommended by staff in the addendum to the staff report, with condition (c) to read: "The proposed accessory buildings as shown on Exhibit A.2: "Building 2" will have 80% masonry on the west façade and south façade, "Building 3" will have 48" of masonry at the base of the north façade, and "Building 4" will have 48" of masonry at the base of the south façade." Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailes, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts,

Sandy Bahan, Jim Gasaway, Dave Boeck, Cindy Gordon

NAYES None

MEMBERS ABSENT Chris Lewis

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1516-11 as amended to the City Council, passed by a vote of 8-0.

Item No. 8, being:

O-1516-12 - GRUBBS CONSULTING, L.L.C. AND 7-ELEVEN, L.L.C./7-ELEVEN, INC. REQUEST SPECIAL USE FOR AN AUTOMOTIVE SERVICE STATION (FUEL SALES) IN CONJUNCTION WITH A CONVENIENCE STORE FOR PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, AND LOCATED AT 1201 12<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE N.E.

#### ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

- Location Map
- 2. Staff Report
- 3. Final Site Plan
- 4. Final Plat
- 5. Pre-Development Summary

# PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Janay Greenlee – Grubbs Consulting, L.L.C. and 7-Eleven, Inc. are asking for a special use for automobile service station in conjunction with a convenience store at 1201 12th Avenue N.E. This is the existing zoning; it is C-1 for all three of these subject tracts. The existing land use right now is the 7-Eleven convenience store, a liquor store, and then the car wash that's directly behind it with two storage buildings that accompany the car wash. This is the site development plan. They are currently going through platting right now to combine these three lots because the special use was only existent on this front lot for the fuel station. There was a special use in existence for the car wash, but not for the northernmost lot. They are combining and making this all one lot and one block, so the special use will be for the entire development. As you can see, they're updating this. All their fuel stations will be on the west side of the convenience store and the retail center, eliminating the gas station over here and eliminating the car wash.

This is the site itself. Looking to the north. And the liquor store, that always goes with the 7-Eleven. The car wash in the rear. On the north side there is multi-family. Side of the car wash from the rear – so that's to the east of the 7-Eleven. Looking back to the west. The Dollar General that's directly to the east of the site. And directly across the street from the Dollar General commercial/retail development. And, of course, there is a gas station directly to the south of the 7-Eleven. This is looking to the south off of 12th. And Griffin Park across the street to the west. And again Griffin. And looking north.

Like I said, this is a special use for the automobile service station for fuel sales, combining the three lots into one and updating and giving the whole place – kind of that corner – a facelift to what is there now. Staff does support Ordinance No. O-1516-12. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

2. Ms. Gordon – Are they keeping the liquor store? Or is that gone away?

Ms. Greenlee – The whole thing is being demolished. The car wash, the 7-Eleven, and the liquor store. Something very similar to what they did over on Flood and Robinson – that redevelopment. The applicant is here. He does have a short presentation.

#### PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Mark Grubbs, Grubbs Consulting, 1819 South Morgan Road, on behalf of the applicant – If I would have saw her presentation before I put mine together, then I probably could have gotten rid of some of the slides, because they're almost identical. Here's the existing zoning. The only thing that I would like to add that the 7-Eleven currently sits on the two west tracts of the existing zoning and it is C-1 permitted with fuel sales currently. So when I originally met with staff, they just asked that I do all one zoning for all the parcels and put it under one zoning ordinance. So, essentially, just adding fuel sales to the east tract, which currently has a special use permit for the car wash. Existing site aerial just so you can see that you have the 7-Eleven building, liquor store, a couple of fuel pumps, the storage buildings, and the car wash there, which will all go away and redevelop. Existing site photos. You've already seen them. Site plan. You've already seen it. This is just a site plan that we did to kind of show it overlaid. The red is all the site plan as proposed, with all the existing buildings in gray that are underneath it that are going away.

This is 7-Eleven – I asked them to give me a rendering for their new building style. I don't know how many people make it into Oklahoma City. There's only one prototype out thus far. It's at Northwest Expressway and MacArthur currently. But they don't have a rendering for the additional spaces beside it. So this is kind of what their new prototype is going to, but it will just be additions on with the additional lease space. Kind of a night picture of it. So envision that bigger. But it is – besides the building, it's kind of like Flood and Robinson. We're doing the same kind of development there. Cleaning up the site.

2. Mr. Boeck – So the canopy over the extensive pumps now – like On-Cue they pull that canopy all the way to the building.

Mr. Grubbs – They did not do that. I don't know if they'll eventually adapt that or not. I just know that they're kind of updating – giving themselves a facelift.

3. Ms. Pailes – Are you supplying fencing between yourself and the residential area to the east?

Mr. Grubbs – I don't have a residential area to the east. That would be Dollar General.

Ms. Pailes – Oh, that's right. I'm one lot off.

## **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

None

# DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1516-12 to the City Council. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailes, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts,

Sandy Bahan, Jim Gasaway, Dave Boeck, Cindy Gordon

NAYES None

MEMBERS ABSENT Chris Lewis

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1516-12 to the City Council, passed by a vote of 8-0.

Item No. 9, being:

#### MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

1. Ms. Connors – Many of you received some emails regarding a property at the northeast corner of Lindsey and Berry. There was an application for pre-development and Planning Commission for that corner. You got those emails because there was a misunderstanding that it might be on tonight's agenda. It was not. Never was. It has never been advertised. But today we received an email withdrawing that application. So it's no longer an application pending before the Planning Commission. I just wanted to make that clear, because we've had a lot of interest in that location. So, as of now, there is no application for a rezoning on that property.

\* \* \*

Item No. 10, being:

## **A**DJOURNMENT

Dave Boeck moved to adjourn. Erin Williford seconded the motion. There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:56 p.m.

Norman Planning Commission